



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Applicant's attorney that the argument (in the after final amendment filed March 28, 2005) regarding claim 1 being patentably distinguishable over Kreiser et al. ('843) was persuasive because the prior art reference does not teach or suggest arranging the display on the glove. However, the argument is not persuasive for claim 16 because claim 16 lacks this limitation. Examiner suggested an amendment to claim 16 to include the limitation that the display be arranged on the glove. An agreement was made for an Examiner's amendment to claim 16 to put the claims in condition for allowance.